1	Peter Urhausen Esq. SBN 160392 Sean Conley Esq. SBN 130814	
2	GIBBONS & CONLEY	
3	3480 Buskirk Ave., Suite 200 Pleasant Hill, CA 94523	
	T: 925.932.3600	
4	F: 925.932.1623	
5	Assumed for Defendant CITY OF COTATI	MICHAEL
6	Attorney for Defendant CITY OF COTATI, PARISH, MARK LANDMAN, JOH	N MOORE,
7	JOHN DELLOSSO, WENDY SKILI SUSAN HARVEY, DAMIEN O'BII	
8	PARKER	
9		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11		
12	LAURIE ELIZABETH ALDERMAN,	Case No. 19-cv-05844-KAW
13	Plaintiffs,	Assigned to: Magistrate Judge Kandis A.Westmore
14	v.))
15	CITY OF COTATI, MICHAEL PARISH,	PROPOSED] ORDER ON DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS, STRIKE, AND FOR
16	MARK LANDMAN, JOHN MOORE, JOHN DELLOSSO, WENDY SKILLMAN,	MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT OF
17	SUSAN HARVEY, DAMIEN O'BID,	
	VICKI PARKER.	December 12, 2019 1:30 p.m.
18	Defendants.	Courtroom: TBD
19	Belefidants.)) Antina Filad Santambar 10, 2010
20		Action Filed: September 19, 2019
21		
22		
23	The Court, having considered the papers filed herewith, and good cause appearing, orders as	
24	follows:	
25	1. The claims against all Defendants are dismissed with prejudice. Plaintiff has failed to state	
	cause of action with respect to each of the Defendants.	
26	2. [In the alternative] the claims against Defendants Skillman, Harvey, O'Bid, and Parker are	
27	2. [m the alternative] the claims against	Detendants Skinnian, Harvey, O Diu, and Farker are
28		1

11

12 13

14

16

15

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

Dated:

24

25 26

27

28

- dismissed without leave to amend. The allegations against these Defendants fail to state a cause of action under applicable law.
- 3. [In the alternative] the allegations found in paragraphs 18-58 and 70 are stricken without leave to amend. These allegations predate the filing of the Complaint by a sufficient period that claims based upon these events are barred by the applicable statute of limitations, and therefore, these allegations are immaterial and impertinent to the claims in this action.
- 4. [In the alternative] the claims of the first cause of action are dismissed with prejudice and/or stricken without leave to amend. The allegations of this cause of action fail to state a cause of action under applicable law, and therefore the claimed matters are immaterial and impertinent.
- [In the alternative] the claims of the second cause of action are dismissed with prejudice and/or stricken without leave to amend. The allegations of this cause of action fail to state a cause of action under applicable law, and therefore the claimed matters are immaterial and impertinent.
- 6. [In the alternative] the claims of the third cause of action are dismissed with prejudice and/or stricken without leave to amend. The allegations of this cause of action fail to state a cause of action under applicable law, and therefore the claimed matters are immaterial and impertinent.
- 7. [In the alternative] the claims against the individual Defendants are dismissed without leave to amend because the Defendants are entitled to qualified immunity.
- 8. [In the alternative] the request for punitive damages is dismissed with prejudice.

JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT